

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10 were rejected under § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,171,468 to Yeung *et al.* (“Yeung”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Yeung. Claims 1, 7 and 10 are independent claims.

Yeung discloses a document management system, not a file transfer system. In a document management system, users post documents to a central repository and access these documents remotely. Alternatively, a file transfer method and system, such as that disclosed in claims 1-10, tracks the progression of files from one user terminal to another, tracking only the location history information centrally. Thus, Yeung, a document management system, is completely irrelevant to the present invention, the flow of a file among multiple users. Putting aside this integral difference between the cited prior art and the present invention, the rejected claims are patentable over Yeung because Yeung does not disclose the limitations of the claims.

Among the limitations in claim 1 not present in Yeung is “updating attribute information for said file” during a “file transfer action.” The Office Action alleges that this limitation is disclosed by Yeung. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Because Yeung discloses a document management system in which documents are accessed from a central repository, not a file transfer method where files are transferred among terminals. There is no facility in Yeung for transferring a file and therefore, no method or system for updating attribute information during a file transfer action, as required by claim 1. Yeung’s document attributes, “Publishing Date, Expiration Date, Title, and Description,” are created only when a document is first

uploaded to the central repository. Col. 11, ln. 62 – col. 12, ln. 6. After the document is posted, the attributes Title and Description are updated at will by the user. Col. 12, Ins. 6-11. The file is never transferred, so the attributes are never updated during a file transfer action, as required by claim 1.

Also among the limitations of claim 1 absent in Yeung is

[A] unique ID inherited from the attribute information from which the update derives, a sub-ID different from any previously issued sub-ID under the unique ID, and a parent sub-ID identical to the sub-ID from the attribute information from which the update derives.

The Office Action equates the unique ID of claim 1 with Yeung's file name and the sub-ID of claim 1 with Yeung's path or folder name. *See* p. 2; *see also*, col. 15, ln. 45 – col. 17, ln. 65. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this comparison.

A file name does not satisfy the requirements of claim 1, wherein the unique ID is "inherited from the attribute information from which the update derives." A file name, or rather, document name, in Yeung, is arbitrarily defined by the user who creates the file and has no relationship with any attributes. Furthermore, there is no requirement in Yeung that a document name be unique.

A path or folder name is not "a sub-ID different from any previously issued sub-ID," as required by claim 1, because a path and folder name is not unique. A path or folder name merely defines the location of a file and multiple files in the same folder or general path can share the same path or folder.

After stating that Yeung discloses a parent sub-ID, the Office Action does not equate any element of Yeung to this requirement. *See* p. 2. The Office Action directs Applicant to col. 15, ln. 45 – col. 17, ln. 65 of Yeung, which does not disclose a parent

sub-ID or any element “identical to the sub-ID from the attribute information from which the update derives,” as required by claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Yeung. Claims 2-6 are patentable over Yeung by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Claim 3 is additionally patentable over Yeung because Yeung does not disclose, “creating a tree model structure in which the tree is formed by connecting file transfer action data with a parent sub-ID,” as disclosed in claim 3. Like the majority of Windows applications, Yeung uses a tree display, but no file transfer action data is collected or displayed by Yeung’s tree display. Page 2 of the Office Action alleges that Yeung’s interface display is “similar to that claimed,” but no reference is given within the prior art to support this assertion. Instead, the Office Action directs Applicant to col. 21, In. 15 – col. 29, In. 35. Nowhere in the cited portion of Yeung is it disclosed how the folder tree structure display discloses “file transfer action data,” as required by claim 3. As stated earlier, Yeung does not track any file transfer action data and clearly cannot display any data it does not track.

Among the limitations of claims 7 and 10 not present in Yeung is attribute information comprising, “a sub-ID to identify one of the transfer actions of said file, and a parent sub-ID to identify the preceding one of transfer actions of said file.” The Office Action alleges that this limitation is disclosed by Yeung. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yeung’s attributes do not meet the limitations of the attributes in claims 7 and 10. The Office Action equates the sub-ID of claims 7 and 10 with Yeung’s path or folder name. *See p. 2; see also, col. 15, In. 45 – col. 17, In. 65.* A path or folder name is not “a sub-ID to identify one of the transfer actions of said file,” as required by claims 7 and 10. A path or folder name displays the current location of a file, but gives no indication

as to its location history. After stating that Yeung discloses a parent sub-ID, the Office Action does not equate any element of Yeung to this requirement. See p. 2. The Office Action directs Applicant to col. 15, ln. 45 – col. 17, ln. 65 of Yeung, which do not disclose a parent sub-ID or any element “to identify the preceding one of transfer actions of said file,” as required by claims 7 and 10. Yeung’s attributes contain no information about the transfer actions of a file because Yeung is a document management system, not a file transfer system, and does not have any file transfer functionality.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 7 and 10 are patentable over Yeung. Claims 8-9 are patentable over Yeung by virtue of their dependence on claim 7.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Ian R. Blum/

By \_\_\_\_\_

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorneys for Applicant